

The *South African Journal of Science* follows a double-anonymous peer review model but encourages Reviewers and Authors to publish their anonymised review reports and response letters, respectively, as supplementary files after manuscript review and acceptance. For more information, see [Publishing peer review reports](#).

Peer review history for:

Buchmann E, Gabela J, Koopman A, Mhlongo S, Mthembu T, Porter R, et al. The end of the beginning: Establishing isiZulu names for all bird species recorded in South Africa. *S Afr J Sci.* 2024;120(5/6), Art. #16184. <https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2024/16184>

HOW TO CITE:

The end of the beginning: Establishing isiZulu names for all bird species recorded in South Africa [peer review history]. *S Afr J Sci.* 2024;120(5/6), Art. #16184. <https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2024/16184/peerreview>

Reviewer D: Round 1

Date completed: 06 August 2023

Recommendation: **Accept** / Revisions required / Resubmit for review / Decline

Conflicts of interest: None declared

Does the manuscript fall within the scope of SAJS?

Yes/No

Is the manuscript written in a style suitable for a non-specialist and is it of wider interest than to specialists alone?

Yes/No

Does the manuscript contain sufficient novel and significant information to justify publication?

Yes/No

Do the Title and Abstract clearly and accurately reflect the content of the manuscript?

Yes/No

Is the research problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes/No

Are the methods described comprehensively?

Yes/No

Is the statistical treatment appropriate?

Yes/No/Not applicable/Not qualified to judge

Do you believe somebody with more methodological expertise in the area of this study than you have needs to review this?

Yes/No

If yes, can you suggest the type of expertise needed.

Not applicable

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the research results?

Yes/Partly/No

Please rate the manuscript on overall contribution to the field

Excellent/Good/Average/Below average/Poor

Please rate the manuscript on language, grammar and tone

Excellent/Good/Average/Below average/Poor

Is the manuscript succinct and free of repetition and redundancies?

Yes/No

Are the results and discussion confined to relevance to the objective(s)?

Yes/No

The number of tables in the manuscript is

Too few/**Adequate**/Too many/Not applicable

The number of figures in the manuscript is
Too few/**Adequate**/Too many/Not applicable

Is the supplementary material relevant and separated appropriately from the main document?
Yes/No/**Not applicable**

Please rate the manuscript on overall quality
Excellent/Good/Average/Below average/Poor

Is appropriate and adequate reference made to other work in the field?
Yes/No

Is it stated that ethical approval was granted by an institutional ethics committee for studies involving human subjects and non-human vertebrates?
Yes/No/**Not applicable**

If accepted, would you recommend that the article receives priority publication?
Yes/No

Are you willing to review a revision of this manuscript?
Yes/No

Select a recommendation:
Accept / Revisions required / Resubmit for review / Decline

With regard to our policy on 'Publishing peer review reports', do you give us permission to publish your anonymised peer review report alongside the authors' response, as a supplementary file to the published article? Publication is voluntary and only with permission from both yourself and the author.

Yes/No

Comments to the Author:

No additional comments provided.

Author response to Reviewer D: Round 1

Not applicable

Reviewer G: Round 1

Date completed: 07 November 2023

Recommendation: **Accept** / Revisions required / Resubmit for review / Decline

Conflicts of interest: None declared

Does the manuscript fall within the scope of SAJS?

Yes/No

Is the manuscript written in a style suitable for a non-specialist and is it of wider interest than to specialists alone?

Yes/No

Does the manuscript contain sufficient novel and significant information to justify publication?

Yes/No

Do the Title and Abstract clearly and accurately reflect the content of the manuscript?

Yes/No

Is the research problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes/No

Are the methods described comprehensively?

Yes/No

Is the statistical treatment appropriate?

Yes/No/Not applicable/Not qualified to judge

Do you believe somebody with more methodological expertise in the area of this study than you have needs to review this?

Yes/No

If yes, can you suggest the type of expertise needed.

Not applicable

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the research results?

Yes/Partly/No

Please rate the manuscript on overall contribution to the field

Excellent/**Good**/Average/Below average/Poor

Please rate the manuscript on language, grammar and tone

Excellent/Good/Average/Below average/Poor

Is the manuscript succinct and free of repetition and redundancies?

Yes/No

Are the results and discussion confined to relevance to the objective(s)?

Yes/No

The number of tables in the manuscript is

Too few/**Adequate**/Too many/Not applicable

The number of figures in the manuscript is

Too few/**Adequate**/Too many/Not applicable

Is the supplementary material relevant and separated appropriately from the main document?

Yes/No/Not applicable

Please rate the manuscript on overall quality

Excellent/**Good**/Average/Below average/Poor

Is appropriate and adequate reference made to other work in the field?

Yes/No

Is it stated that ethical approval was granted by an institutional ethics committee for studies involving human subjects and non-human vertebrates?

Yes/No/Not applicable

If accepted, would you recommend that the article receives priority publication?

Yes/No

Are you willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

Yes/No

Select a recommendation:

Accept / Revisions required / Resubmit for review / Decline

With regard to our policy on 'Publishing peer review reports', do you give us permission to publish your anonymised peer review report alongside the authors' response, as a supplementary file to the published article? Publication is voluntary and only with permission from both yourself and the author.

Yes/No

Comments to the Author:

This was the final report of a long and important process. There were thus few surprises but the material was useful. The author(s) did not, however, consider the thorny topic of linguistic imperialism among indigenous African languages. Some examples: where other Nguni languages (Swati, Xhosa, Ndebele) had names for birds, might it have been an idea to try to collate or draw on that knowledge? In the case of birds occurring outside KZN, did other indigenous languages have names that might or should have been considered, particularly if the Zulu names are now going to be used as the basis for other African language bird names? The authors give the example of Rudd's Lark in Mpumalanga, in a predominantly Swati speaking area. Was there no Swati name? Similarly, are there no Xhosa names for coastal or wading birds that might have been considered? It would seem a pity if one ended up with rival Nguni names as this might rather damage than assist the process of indigenous interest in conservation.

Author response to Reviewer G: Round 1

This was the final report of a long and important process. There were thus few surprises but the material was useful. The author(s) did not, however, consider the thorny topic of linguistic imperialism among indigenous African languages. Some examples: where other Nguni languages (Swati, Xhosa, Ndebele) had names for birds, might it have been an idea to try to collate or draw on that knowledge? In the case of birds occurring outside KZN, did other indigenous languages have names that might or should have been considered,

particularly if the Zulu names are now going to be used as the basis for other African language bird names? The authors give the example of Rudd's Lark in Mpumalanga, in a predominantly Swati speaking area. Was there no Swati name? Similarly, are there no Xhosa names for coastal or wading birds that might have been considered? It would seem a pity if one ended up with rival Nguni names as this might rather damage than assist the process of indigenous interest in conservation.

AUTHOR: Our response on 'linguistic imperialism' appears on in added text, in red font, on Page 9, with a reference added (reference #28).

Reviewer L: Round 1

Date completed: 29 February 2024

Recommendation: **Accept** / Revisions required / Resubmit for review / Decline

Conflicts of interest: None declared

Does the manuscript fall within the scope of SAJS?

Yes/No

Is the manuscript written in a style suitable for a non-specialist and is it of wider interest than to specialists alone?

Yes/No

Does the manuscript contain sufficient novel and significant information to justify publication?

Yes/No

Do the Title and Abstract clearly and accurately reflect the content of the manuscript?

Yes/No

Is the research problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes/No

Are the methods described comprehensively?

Yes/No

Is the statistical treatment appropriate?

Yes/No/Not applicable/Not qualified to judge

Do you believe somebody with more methodological expertise in the area of this study than you have needs to review this?

Yes/No

If yes, can you suggest the type of expertise needed.

Not applicable

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the research results?

Yes/Partly/No

Please rate the manuscript on overall contribution to the field

Excellent/Good/Average/Below average/Poor

Please rate the manuscript on language, grammar and tone

Excellent/Good/Average/Below average/Poor

Is the manuscript succinct and free of repetition and redundancies?

Yes/No

Are the results and discussion confined to relevance to the objective(s)?

Yes/No

The number of tables in the manuscript is

Too few/**Adequate**/Too many/Not applicable

The number of figures in the manuscript is

Too few/**Adequate**/Too many/Not applicable

Is the supplementary material relevant and separated appropriately from the main document?

Yes/No/Not applicable

Please rate the manuscript on overall quality

Excellent/Good/Average/Below average/Poor

Is appropriate and adequate reference made to other work in the field?

Yes/No

Is it stated that ethical approval was granted by an institutional ethics committee for studies involving human subjects and non-human vertebrates?

Yes/No/Not applicable

If accepted, would you recommend that the article receives priority publication?

Yes/No

Are you willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

Yes/No

Select a recommendation:

Accept / Revisions required / Resubmit for review / Decline

With regard to our policy on 'Publishing peer review reports', do you give us permission to publish your anonymised peer review report alongside the authors' response, as a supplementary file to the published article? Publication is voluntary and only with permission from both yourself and the author.

Yes/No

Comments to the Author:

In your study on the nomenclature of birds unknown in KZN, you have produced a scholarly work of exceptional quality that deserves commendation. I have just one orthographic suggestion: The colonial-apartheid era saw the elimination of the prefixes in our languages' names for English compatibility. But the constitution correctly names our languages by their full names: IsiZulu, IsiXhosa, IsiNdebele, Siswati, etc. It is therefore constitutionally correct and patriotic to write these languages with their prefixes, regardless of the context or language – for example, IsiZulu instead of just Zulu. By doing so, we will demonstrate our sincere commitment to decolonization, as well as the promotion, further development, and intellectualization of these African languages. Overall, this is an interesting, high-quality paper with implications for the advancement of African languages in general.

Author response to Reviewer L: Round 1

In your study on the nomenclature of birds unknown in KZN, you have produced a scholarly work of exceptional quality that deserves commendation. I have just one orthographic suggestion: The colonial-apartheid era saw the elimination of the prefixes in our languages' names for English compatibility. But the constitution correctly names our languages by their full names: IsiZulu, IsiXhosa, IsiNdebele, Siswati, etc. It is therefore constitutionally correct and patriotic to write these languages with their prefixes, regardless of the context or language – for example, IsiZulu instead of just Zulu. By doing so, we will demonstrate our sincere commitment to decolonization, as well as the promotion, further development, and intellectualization of these African languages. Overall, this is an interesting, high-quality paper with implications for the advancement of African languages in general.

AUTHOR: On the suggestion that we use 'isiZulu' instead of 'Zulu' when referring to the language of the Zulu people, we accept that advice and have changed all nouns and adjectives in the title, abstract, main text, tables and figures to be as 'isiZulu' instead of 'Zulu'. These changes are numerous and have not been highlighted.

Author response: Other additions

Given the long duration between our submission and the reviews, there has been some progress with the isiZulu names, in terms of national recognition, and this is described in six lines in red font on Page 8 and in 3 lines of red font on Page 10. These are important updates on the state of the work we have done and are continuing. One reference has been added (reference #28).